

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,227	PAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney B. White	3636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) David L. Tarnoff (#32,383). (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 22 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 20.


Identification of prior art discussed: Pal et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,863,343 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RODNEY B. WHITE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed that the tensioning device operatively coupled to the vertical support portion to apply tension in at least a part of the vertical support portion of the head restraining member when the left and right headrest members are in a swung forward state is not the same as the auxiliary force adding device that applies an auxiliary urging force to the left and right headrest members in the deployment direction of the head restraining member. The key difference is that the auxiliary force adding device functions during deployment of the left and right headrest members whereas the tensioning device applies the tension to at least part of the vertical support portion of the head restraining member when the left and right headrest members are already in the swung forward or deployed state. It was agreed that Claims 1 and 20 of the present invention needed the "during the deployment of the left and right headrest members", as well as some minor changes in the language in both Claims. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and entered as such .